

Appl. No. 10/650,301
Amdt. dated November 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 7, 2005

Remarks

The present amendment responds to the Official Action mailed October 7, 2005. At page 3, that action repeated a rejection of claims 1 and 16 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 22 of Adamec et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,243,690 (Adamec). It is believed that this rejection resulted from a word processing error as a terminal disclaimer was previously submitted. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-15 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. On page 4, the action indicates claims 1, 3-5, 8-15 and 21 would be allowable if amended to overcome the Section 112 rejection and claims 16-20 were allowed.

Obviousness Double Patenting

A check of the PAIR system confirms that the terminal disclaimer was filed July 14, 2005 and was accepted November 10, 2005. A printout is attached as Exhibit A hereto. Please call the undersigned if this issue is not resolved by this filing.

Section 112


Consistently with the usage of claim 16 which stands allowed, claim 1 has hereby been amended to read "a promotional display message" rather than "a message" in the second to last line. As described at page 8, lines 10-12, an exemplary "promotional display message" includes a promotional message to be displayed and a time period for which the message is to be displayed. See also, page 5, lines 18-20.

Appl. No. 10/650,301
Amdt. dated November 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 7, 2005

Conclusion

It is respectfully requested that this case now be promptly allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter H. Priest
Reg. No. 30,210
Priest & Goldstein, PLLC
5015 Southpark Drive, Suite 230
Durham, NC 27713-7736
(919) 806-1600